UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/581,515	04/22/2008	Jack Gilron	4110-57	9482	
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 10/12/201 NDERHYE, PC	0	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	DRODGE, JOSEPH W			
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1772		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/12/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Occurrence	10/581,515	GILRON ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Joseph W. Drodge	1797		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	J. lely filed the mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,	
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
	_ · ·			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merit				
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-10 and 12-22</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2 and 11</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the construction represents the second representation and the correction represents the second representation is objected to by the Examiner 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF	, ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prioric application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

Application/Control Number: 10/581,515

Art Unit: 1797

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1,3-8,10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer patent 5,690,829 in view of Haney patent 6,099,733 and Wheatley et al patent 4,176,057.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer patent 5,690,829 in view of Haney patent 6,099,733 and Wheatley et al patent 4,176,057 as applied to claims 1,3-8,10 and 12 above, and further in view of Randhahn et al patent 5,415,781.

Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer patent 5,690,829 in view of Haney patent 6,099,733 and Wheatley et al patent 4,176,057 as applied to claims 1,3-8,10 and 12 above, and further in view of Jogand et al patent 6,036,867.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer patent 5,690,829 in view of Haney patent 6,099,733 and Wheatley et al patent 4,176,057 as applied to claims 1,3-8,10 and 12 above, and further in view of Zeiher et al patent 6,838,001 and Andou et al patent 6,432,310.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer patent 5,690,829 in view of Haney patent 6,099,733 and Wheatley et al patent 4,176,057 as applied to claims 1,3-8,10 and 12 above, and further in view of Jogand et al patent 6,036,867 as applied to claims 9 and 18 above, and additionally in view of Kragh patent 4,318,772.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer patent 5,690,829 in view of Haney patent 6,099,733 and Wheatley et al patent 4,176,057 as applied to claims 1,3-8,10 and 12 above, and further in view of Jogand et al patent 6,036,867 as applied to claims 9 and 18 above, and additionally in view of Harris et al patent 6,468,389.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 2 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2 and 11 would distinguish in view of

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Joseph Drodge at his direct government telephone number of 571-272-1140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from approximately 8:00 AM to 1:00PM and 2:30 PM to 5:30 PM.

Page 4

Alternatively, to contact the examiner, send a communication via E-mail communication to the Examiner's Patent Office E-mail address: "Joseph.Drodge@uspto.gov". Such E-main communication should be in accordance with provisions of MPEP (Manual of Patent Examination Procedures) section 502.03 & related MPEP sections. E-mail communication must begin with a statement authorizing the E-mail communication and acknowledging that such communication is not secure and will be made of record, under Patent Internet Usage Policy Article 5. A suggested format for such authorization is as follows: "Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Additionally, the examiner's supervisor, In Suk Bullock, of Technology Center Unit 1772, can reached at 571-272-5954.

The formal facsimile phone number, for official, formal communications, for the examining group where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300. The facsimile phone number for informal communication directly with the examiner is 571-273-1140.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR, and through Private PAIR only for unpublished applications. For more Application/Control Number: 10/581,515 Page 5

Art Unit: 1797

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD 10/4/2010 /Joseph W. Drodge/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797